Ham-Policy Digest            Thu,  8 Sep 94        Volume 94 : Issue  431

Today's Topics:
            Sum'tin for nut'in and chicks for free (3 msgs)

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party.  Your mileage may vary.  So there.
----------------------------------------------------------------------

Date: 7 Sep 1994 15:16:59 GMT
From: news2.near.net!cat.cis.Brown.EDU!pstc3.pstc.brown.edu!md@yale.arpa
Subject: Sum'tin for nut'in and chicks for free
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

little@iamu.chi.dec.com (Todd Little) writes:

> Ah, but your totally unsubstantiated opinion is better?

People make the claim that there are these thousands of engineers just
waiting to get into ham radio. They made that claim three years ago with
the no-code license. Where are they? I haven't seen hoards of professionals
"who would get involved in ham radio if there wasn't that useless code test"
flooding the bands. I *have* seen hoards of CB transplants. Of course, I'm
only speaking for 400,000 square miles worth of region 1, though.


> Always have to a label for folks and make the broad sweeping generalizations.
> What's the matter Michael, are you afraid you might meet some blue-collar
> worker on the bands and that your entire biased view of the world might
> come unglued?  Give us a break already and save the bigotry for some other
> newsgroup like alt.flame.

Spare me the drivel. There are clear demographic differences between
white and blue collar people.

> Funny, almost everyone I know that has entered the hobby since the
> introduction of the no-code license is a "professional".

Guess you happen to live in a lucky area.

> Also you continue to make these
> red-herring statements such as 'because the CW requirement was "too hard"'.
> Where is that claim made in this newsgroup?

People who routinely stick up their nose at something and say "oh, that's
beneath me" (sort of like with the cw requirement) remind me of kids in the
schoolyard who couldn't or were too afraid to try something and would call
the activity "stupid" or "worthless".

> Another unsupported sweeping generalization.  All I've heard folks suggest
> in this newsgroup is a modernizing of the testing emphasis.  Simply because
> you don't believe a better test can be developed doesn't mean it won't be.

For all the talk here I've yet to see anything concrete or useful.

> I have a great deal of respect for someone that can remember all the names
> of the people in a room full of strangers.  Big deal, idiot savants can
> do that.  Maybe we should make memorizing all the names and phone numbers
> in the Chicago telephone directory a licensing requirement.  You'd respect
> someone that could do that, wouldn't you?

You mean like memorizing the question pools?

> Ah yes, lets use your stated example. Please give the specific job
> requirements and duties that dictate the specification of a 120 lbs?

Can't say, I've never applied for the position of a state trooper.

> Maybe you'd prefer
> it if the specification was instead that police officers be white anglo saxon
> protestant males born in this country after 1950.  Those all sounds about
> as relevant.

Maybe I'd prefer that if the standard for a firefighter is running a 5
minute mile while carrying a 75 lb pack on his/her back, that the people
who apply for the position meet the requirement instead of whining to

change it. I don't want my life to depend on a slacker.



MD
--
--  #queue <dire_straits.voc>
--  "I want my,
--    I want my,
--    I want my free CB..."

------------------------------

Date: 7 Sep 1994 15:33:26 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!cat.cis.Brown.EDU!
pstc3.pstc.brown.edu!md@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Sum'tin for nut'in and chicks for free
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes:

> I just wish that people would learn that not everyone can learn the code,
> nor does everyone have the time to devote to it even if it were possible.
> And I wish that people would stop "whining" about what others choose to
> discuss.

People who can't learn the code for medical reasons have an existing
route to take -- medical waivers.

Other people who can't learn the code have convinced themselves of it.
I convinced myself 10 years ago that code was "too hard" and didn't get
my license until 1992, when I finally convinced myself that I was going
to do it.

MD
--
--  #queue <dire_straits.voc>
--  "I want my,
--    I want my,
--    I want my free HT..."

------------------------------

Date: Wed, 07 Sep 94 14:27:13 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcomsv!skyld!jangus@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Sum'tin for nut'in and chicks for free
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <34ilat$6r2@cat.cis.Brown.EDU> md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu writes:

> In article <34ijf2$h4c@chnews.intel.com>,
>    cmoore@fallout (Cecil A. Moore -FT-~) writes:
>
> |> Most of the no-code tech's I know are engineers. A couple are PhD's.
>
> Most of the no-code techs I know are no-brain lamers. "Uh, trig-o-no-metry?
> Whas that?"
>
> Guess it just depends where you live.
>

  It says more for the friends you hang out with.

 Amateur: WA6FWI@WA6FWI.#SOCA.CA.USA.NOAM | "You have a flair for adding
Internet: jangus@skyld.grendel.com          |  a fanciful dimension to any
 US Mail: PO Box 4425 Carson, CA 90749    |  story."
   Phone: 1 (310) 324-6080                  |            Peking Noodle Co.

Hate "Green Card Lottery"? Want to help curb ignorant crossposting on Usenet?
E-mail ckeroack@hamp.hampshire.edu for more information, or read news.groups.

-----------------------------

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #431
*****************************